



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,411	11/19/2003	Shih-Hsiung Weng	TAIW 195	5319
<div>7590 RABIN & BERDO, P.C. Suite 500 1101 14 Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005</div>				
<div>12/23/2008</div>				
<div>EXAMINER PARRY, CHRISTOPHER L</div>				
<div>ART UNIT</div>		<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>		
<div>2421</div>				
<div>MAIL DATE</div>		<div>DELIVERY MODE</div>		
<div>12/23/2008</div>		<div>PAPER</div>		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,411

Applicant(s)

WENG ET AL.

Examiner

CHRIS PARRY

Art Unit

2421

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 4 of the specification is missing a reference to figure 4.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohno et al. "Ohno" (US 2003/0161332 A1).

Regarding Claim 5, Ohno discloses a web AV recording method comprising the steps of:

verifying that an AV signal is received (¶ 0083 and 0087);

determining that the AV signal is an external signal (i.e., TCP/IP processing section 406 determines data is destined for a device on the 1394 network and TCP/IP

406 sends the translated data to AV section 407 and transmits the data onto the 1394 bus destined for networked device) (¶ 0087);

scheduling the AV signal (i.e., IP network processing section 406 sends data to AV protocol processing section 407 and AV 407 will schedule the transmission of data onto the 1394 bus destined for determined networked device) (¶ 0087);

determining a destination web address of a destination device for the AV signal (i.e., CPU 301 stores a translation table 414 which indicates association relations among IP addresses, unique IDs, and node IDs of the destination devices and the table is referenced in order to transmit data to a device on the 1394 network) (figure 5; ¶ 0093);

verifying that the destination device is a web device (i.e., CPU 301 looks up the IPv6 address of the device the data is destined for using table 500 stored in storage 414) (¶ 0087 and 0093);

determining a transmission path using a comparison table, which comprises the correspondence relations between web device addresses and their web addresses (¶ 0087 and 0093); and

transmitting the AV signal to the destination device (i.e., AV processing section 407 receives the translated data and transmits the data onto the 1394 bus for the destined device) (¶ 0087).

As for Claim 6, Ohno teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the step of verifying that an AV signal is received is proceeded by the steps of:

scanning the externally connected web device (i.e., node detection section 411 acquires information from devices connected on the 1394 bus) (§ 0090-0093);

identifying the addresses and the web addresses of the web devices (i.e., node detection section 411 acquires the unique IDs and node IDs of the connected devices) (§ 0090-0093);

establishing the comparison table according to the addresses and the web addresses of the web devices (i.e., translation table section 414 holds an address translation table which indicates association relations among IP addresses, unique IDs, and node IDs created by the address generation section 412) (§ 0090-0093); and

storing the comparison table (i.e., table 500 is stored in translation table storage section 414) (§ 0090-0093).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohno et al. "Ohno" (US 2003/0161332 A1) in view of Lym (US 2005/0055722 A1).

Regarding Claim 1, Ohno discloses a web audio/video (AV) recording device (110 – figures 1 and 3) comprising:

a connector (307 and/or 308 – figure 3), which connects to an external web device (i.e., 1394 I/F 308 connects to devices connected to the 1394 bus such as DTV 111 and DVD 112) (§ 0076 and 0081);

a transceiver (300 – figure 3), which connects to the connector [307/308] for transceiving an AV signal (i.e., system bus 300 receives data from 1394 I/F 308 to be routed to CPU 301) (§ 0076 and 0088);

a storage device (302 – figure 3) (§ 0076); and

a processor (301 – figure 3), which connects to the transceiver [300] and the storage device [302] (§ 0076);

wherein after receiving the AV signal transmitted by the transceiver (i.e., data received from the IP network is delivered to the TCP/IP processing section 406 of the CPU 301), the processor [301] schedules the AV signal for processing when the AV signal is determined to be an internal signal (i.e., TCP/IP processing section 406 determines data is destined for own device and thus the data is sent to the control section 401), and schedules the AV signal for transmission when the AV signal is determined to be an external signal (i.e., TCP/IP processing section 406 determines data is destined for a device on the 1394 network and TCP/IP 406 sends the translated data to AV section 407 and transmits the data onto the 1394 bus destined for networked device) and the destination web address (i.e., IPv6 address 510 - figure 5) is found to be a web device (i.e., device 503 (DTV 111) – figure 5) from the comparison table (500 – figure 5) (i.e., CPU 301 stores a translation table 414 which indicates association relations among IP addresses, unique IDs, and node IDs and the table is referenced in

order to transmit data to a device on the 1394 network) (figures 3-5; (¶¶ 0082-0087, 0093, and 0096).

Ohno discloses storing a comparison table (see figure 5) in translation table storage section 414, consisting of correspondence relations between web device addresses (i.e., Node Unique ID 520 - figure 5) and their corresponding web addresses (i.e., IPv6 address 510 – figure 5). However, Ohno fails to specifically disclose storing address translation table 500 in a separate storage device.

In an analogous art, Lym discloses a device (3 – figures 1-2) comprising: a connector (22 – figure 3); a transceiver (25 – figure 3); a storage device (9 – figure 3), which stores a comparison table (13 – figure 3) consisting of correspondence relations between device addresses (12 – figure 3) and their corresponding addresses (11 – figure 3); and a processor (8 – figure 3), which connects to the transceiver [25] and the storage device [9] (¶¶ 0022-0024). Lym discloses it is well known in the art to store comparison tables in a separate storage device to be used by a processor to facilitate determining a path to route data for a destined device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Ohno to include a storage device, which stores a comparison table consisting of correspondence relations between web device addresses and their corresponding web addresses as taught by Lym for the benefit of determining the location of connected devices and automatically routing data to an intended device without requiring user involvement.

As for Claim 2, Ohno and Lym disclose, in particular Ohno teaches wherein the transceiver [300] receives and sends the web device addresses and their web corresponding addresses (i.e., node detection section 411 acquires information such as unique IDs of currently connected devices via I/F 308 and bus 300) and the processor [301] has an address comparison module (410 – figure 4) so as to establish the comparison table when receiving the web device addresses and the corresponding web addresses from the transceiver (i.e., a translation table 414 which indicates association relations among IP addresses, unique IDs, and node IDs and the table is referenced in order to transmit data to a device on the 1394 network) (¶¶ 0083, 0090, 0091, & 0093).

As for Claim 3, Ohno and Lym disclose, in particular Ohno teaches wherein the processor has a signal determination module (406 – figure 4) to determine whether the AV signal is an internal signal or an external signal (¶¶ 0083 & 0087).

As for Claim 4, Ohno and Lym disclose, in particular Ohno teaches wherein the processor has a signal processing module (401 and 409 – figure 4) to process the signal once the AV signal is determined to be an internal signal or an external signal (i.e., if the AV signal is determined to be an internal signal, then IP 406 notifies control section 401 and if the AV signal is determined to be external, then IP 406 sends data to the format translation section 409) (¶¶ 0083 and 0087).

6. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohno in view of Lym.

As for Claim 7, Ohno fails to specifically disclose determining a busy flag positive; and waiting a predetermined time.

In an analogous art, Lym discloses determining a busy flag positive (i.e., determine if external device is available) (§ 0025); and waiting a predetermined time (§ 0025). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Ohno to include determining a busy flag positive and waiting a predetermined time as taught by Lym for the benefit of verifying a device is connected before automatically routing data that is destined for the device.

As for Claim 8, Ohno and Lym disclose, in particular Lym teaches wherein as the result of the step of determining a busy flag positive is non-positive, the busy flag is set to be positive (§ 0025).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRIS PARRY whose telephone number is (571) 272-8328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM EST to 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN MILLER can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CHRIS PARRY
Examiner
Art Unit 2421

/C. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2421

/Hunter B. Lonsberry/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421